REMARKS

Receipt is acknowledged of the Office Action of October 18, 2005. Claims 7-8, 10-11, and 14-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14-20 have been rejected in the Office Action. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicants amended the Claims of the present Application and request reconsideration of the rejection, as explained in more detail below.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 14-17 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 USC §112. Applicants cancelled the rejected limitation from Claims 14-17 and believe that all Claims currently remaining in the Application, i.e. Claims 7-8, 10-11, and 14-20, comply with the requirements of 35 USC §112.

Claim Rejections –35 USC §103

Claims 14-17 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mills (U.S. Patent No. 5,572, 403) in view of Brandt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,604,032). Claims 14-17 were further rejected in the Office Action under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dent (U.S. Patent No. 6,537,019) in view of Brandt et al. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the either of the grounds of rejections above and further in view of Bradbury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,528).

Claims 7-8, 10-11, and 14-20 are currently pending in the Application. Claims 14 and 18 are two remaining independent Claims.

Claim 14 is directed to an apparatus for a serial ventilation device having a casing a first ventilator and a second ventilator. The first ventilator is mounted on an air intake opening side of the casing and includes a first rotating shaft and at least one intake blade. Each intake blade has a front surface, facing the air intake opening side, and is mounted on the first rotating shaft. The second ventilator is mounted on an air exhaust opening side of the casing and includes a second rotating shaft and at least one exhaust blade. Each exhaust blade has a front surface, facing the air exhaust opening side, and is mounted on the second rotating shaft. The first ventilator performs ventilation from a front surface of the intake blade to its rear surface and then towards the second ventilator. The second ventilator performs ventilation from the rear surface of each exhaust blade to its front surface and then towards the exhaust side of the second ventilator. The first rotating shaft is independent from and coaxial to the second rotating shaft. Further, the rotating shafts rotate in opposite directions. Each ventilator further includes a motor base, with an outer circular wall shaped in a tilted configuration such that a diameter of the outer circular wall of the motor base decreases to the midpoint between the first and second ventilators.

The prior art of record does not disclose, teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in Claim 14. Specifically, at least the limitations of the first rotating shaft being independent from and coaxial to the second rotating shaft, and the rotating shafts rotating in opposite directions, are not disclosed in the cited prior art. The Examiner stated in the Office Action that "Brandt discloses two sets of rotors; the first set rotates in the direction of rotation of the shaft and the second set rotates in the direction counter to the rotation of the shaft." *See*, Final Office Action, page 3. However, Applicants do not claim two independent sets of rotors. Instead,

Claim 14 recites: "said first rotating shaft is independent from and coaxial to said second rotating shaft." Contrary to this limitation of Claim 14, Brandt teaches a ***single*** shaft 1 carrying three sets of rotor blades. Even the above-cited statement by the Examiner recognizes the fact that there is only one shaft disclosed in Brandt. However, the Examiner is silent as to how a person skilled in the art would combine the fan of Mills or Dent, which does not have "the first rotating shaft being independent and coaxial to the second rotating shaft," (*See*, Final Office Action, pages 3 and 4) with the ***single*** shaft of Brandt to get the invention claimed in the present Application requiring ***two independent and coaxial*** shafts. Further, nothing in the cited prior art suggests the desirability of such combination, as required by MPEP 2143.01.

Moreover, none of the cited prior art discloses limitations of the independent Claim 14 stating that each ventilator comprises "a motor base, with an outer circular wall shaped in a tilted configuration such that a diameter of the outer circular wall of said motor base decreases to the midpoint between the first and second ventilators." The Final Office Action is silent with respect to this particular limitation. However, MPEP 2143.03 requires that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." Therefore, the Examiner failed to establish the prima facie case of obviousness. Moreover, as explained in the attached Request to Withdraw Finality, Applicants believe that this omission renders the finality of the Office Action premature.

Based on the above, Applicants believe that Claim 14 is patentable over the cited prior art. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 15-17 are believed to define patentable subject matter in view of their dependency upon allowable Claim 14 and, further, on their own merits.

Claim 18 is directed to an apparatus for a serial ventilation device having a first ventilator and a second ventilator. The first ventilator includes a number of intake blades mounted on a first rotating shaft. The second ventilator includes a number of exhaust blades mounted on a second rotating shaft. The number of exhaust blades is at least one blade fewer than the number of intake blades. The first rotating shaft is independent from and coaxial to the second rotating shaft. Further, the rotating shafts rotate in opposite directions. The first and second ventilators are positioned in series with respect to each other such that they ventilate air along the same line in the same direction.

The prior art of record does not disclose, teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in Claim 18. Specifically, as described above with respect to Claim 14, at least the limitations of the first rotating shaft being independent from and coaxial to the second rotating shaft, and the rotating shafts rotating in opposite directions, are not disclosed in the cited prior art. The argument recited above with respect to the similar limitation of Claim 14 is fully applicable here and will not be repeated.

Based on the above, Applicants believe that Claim 18 is patentable over the cited prior art. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 7-8, 10-11, and 19-20 are believed to define patentable subject matter in view of their dependency upon allowable Claim 18 and, further, on their own merits.

The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel if it will advance the prosecution of this application, or with any suggestion to resolve any condition that would impede allowance. In the event that any extension of time is required, Applicant petitions

for that extension of time required to make this response timely. Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 50-0675, Order No. 051319-36.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2006

Anna Vishev

Anna Vishev
Reg. No. 45,018
Schulte Roth & Zabel, LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Tel. (212) 756-2167